duplication of special service functions; and to authorize Federal departments and agencies to provide such services.

An increasingly common characteristic of our Federal system is the extent to which similar governmental functions are performed by all three levels of government—local, State, and Federal. Cooperation and assistance among the three levels in carrying on such activities can yield economies for all. A number of Federal departments already provide specialized services to State and local governments on a reimbursable basis. The Census Bureau makes special censuses or tabulations and collects special additional information during decennial censuses. The Weather Bureau provides meteorological services, and the Bureau of Reclamation undertakes inventories of water resources for State and local governments. As recently as 1962, the Congress authorized the Internal Revenue Service to render statistical services to State and local tax agencies. This bill would extend on a governmentwide basis the principle embodied in these specific cases. Provision for depositing reimbursements to the credit of agency appropriations (sec. 303) would give the agencies an incentive to enter into such arrangements which they do not now have since, unless otherwise provided in law, such reimbursements for service must be paid into Treasury miscellaneous receipts.

Authority to provide service

Section 302: This section authorizes agencies in the executive branch to provide specialized or technical services on written request from a State or local government and upon payment of the cost of the services by the government making the request. Agencies would be permitted, not required, to provide the requested service.

Reimbursement to appropriation

Section 303: This section provides that payments received for furnishing specialized or technical services shall be deposited to the credit of the appropriation from which the cost of providing such services is paid. Performance of the service for State and local governments thus would not interfere with the agencies fiscal ability to fulfill their mandated responsibilities.

Reports to Congress

Section 304: This section calls for an annual report on the scope of the services provided to the Committee on Government Operations of the Senate and House of Representatives.

Definitions

Section 305: The term "State," "political subdivision," and "specialized or technical services" are defined in this section. "Specialized or technical services" means special statistical and other studies and compilations, development projects, technical tests and evaluations, technical information, training activities, surveys, reports, documents, and other similar service functions.

TITLE IV—COORDINATED INTERGOVERNMENTAL POLICY AND ADMINISTRATION OF GRANTS FOR URBAN DEVELOPMENT

Declaration of urban assistance policy

Section 401: This section establishes a national urban assistance policy and makes such a policy, consistent with individual program objectives, applicable to all Federal programs affecting urban development. With the increasing numbers of Federal aids for physical development facilities in urban areas, the need for a unified urban development policy and adequate interagency coordination at the Federal level has become imperative. A recent study by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations of 43 Federal programs of financial aid showed that they are administered by 13 different departments and agencies within the executive branch. A number of new programs have been enacted even since the Commission's study was made a year ago.

Federal program administrators are held responsible for carrying out specific legislative objectives, designed to meet such urban needs as those for urban renewal, area redevelopment, public housing, or highway transportation. But rapid urban growth, coupled with fragmented responsibilities for local government in urban areas and new technologies, are making these programs increasingly interdependent. Their impact on other community physical, economic, and social objectives is becoming more pronounced. Authority, machinery, and effort are needed in Washington as well as in the urban areas themselves to assure that each program contributes not only to the more limited program goals, but also to the general goal of orderly urban development. The legislation establishes the principle of Federal interagency coordination and provides a clear legislative mandate for the President to establish the machinery among the Federal departments and agencies to better meet national, State, and local objectives for urban development.

Favoring general purpose governments

Section 402: This section makes units of general local government, such as cities, counties, and towns, eligible to receive Federal loans and grants for urban development for which only special districts or other special purpose units of local government are now eligible. Although a majority of the acts establishing Federal aid to urban development allow local general government as recipients of such aid, there are a number that encourage establishment of special purpose organizations to carry out program objectives. Some examples of Federal encouragement for establishing counterpart special purpose organizations in local jurisdictions may be found in reclamation, area redevelopment, and agricultural programs. The elected officials of every unit of government should be responsible for a wide range of functions, so that the governing process involves resolution of possible conflicting interests with significant responsibility for balancing governmental needs and resources. The general purpose unts of local government meet these conditions whereas, in many cases, special purpose districts do not.

The legislation would permit the opportunity to simplify intergovernmental relations and reduce the time and effort spent by public officials in coordinating additional independent units of government by providing that, to the extent possible, Federal departments and agencies make Federal aids available to general rather than special purpose units of local government. Any special purpose unit of local government receiving these Federal aids is required to provide full information concerning such aid to the appropriate unit of general local government in the area. Local governments, general or special purpose, are authorized to act as joint sponsors of any federally aided urban project without limiting the total amount of the aid to less than the aggregate available to the participating units of local government acting singly.

Consistency with plans and objectives of general local governments

Section 403: Provides that all applications made to the Federal Government after June 30, 1966, for construction of hospitals, airports, water supply and distribution facilities, sewerage facilities and waste treatment works, water development, and land conservation be certified within 30 days by the unit of general local government in which the project or facility is to be located that such proposed project or facility is consistent with the local government's planning objectives. State and certain regional applicants are exempt from this requirement.

A performance requirement that projects aided by certain Federal loans or grants be consistent with the local government's planning objectives can contribute to insuring effective use of the Federal funds and avoid conflicts with other State, local, and private development projects.

This section establishes similar requirements for consistency with planning efforts of local governments in metropolitan areas for Federal aid programs that significantly affect urban development not currently having such requirements.

More effective utilization of certain Federal loans or grants by encouraging better coordinated local review of State and local applications for such loans or grants

Section 404: Provides that all applications to the Federal Government made after June 30, 1966, for urban renewal and open space land projects and for the construction of hospitals, airports, water supply and distribution facilities, sewerage facilities and waste treatment works, highways, transportation facilities, water development, and land conservation within any metropolitan area shall be accompanied by (1) the comments and recommendations thereon of a planning agency performing metropolitan or regional planning for the area in which the assistance is to be used, and (2) a statement by the applicant that it has considered these comments and recommendations prior to formal application. This section makes it clear, however, that approval of the application by the appropriate Federal agency shall be in accord with pertinent Federal requirements without regard to a possible negative recommendation by the planning agency.

This section is designed to strengthen metropolitan planning and better coordinate local, State, and Federal development activities by (1) encouraging the establishment of responsible metropolitan planning agencies and procedures; (2) stimulating the flow of planning and development information among and between the various levels of government; and (3) assisting the Federal agencies in evaluation of project applications.

To avoid undue delay in the review and comment function, the section provides that the applicant need not include the comments or recommendations of a planning agency if (1) the agency has failed within a 60-day period to make any comments or recommendations on the application itself, or on a plan or description of the project; or (2) the applicant certifies that the application itself is consistent with or in furtherance of projects or plans previously reviewed by the planning agency.

Definitions

Section 405: Defines the terms "comprehensive planning," "hospital," "metropolitan area" or "area," "areawide agency," "State," "special purpose unit of local government," "unit of general local government," and "urban development."

TITLE V—ACQUISITION, USE, AND DISPOSITION OF LAND WITHIN URBAN AREAS BY FEDERAL AGENCIES IN CONFORMITY WITH LAND UTILIZATION PROGRAMS OF AFFECTED LOCAL GOVERNMENTS

Amendment of Federal Property and Administrative Services Act

Section 501: The Federal Government owns over 400 million acres of land throughout the Nation. A significant portion of that land is located in urban areas and the use to which it is put, either by a government agency or upon sale by a private person or corporation, can have a significant impact upon local government. In order to insure that the use of such land is, to the maximum extent possible, consistent with local zoning and land use practices and local planning and development objectives, it is essential that such local governments be fully informed of transactions involving Federal land acquisition or disposal and significant changes in use of Federal lands. Actions of these types can have a significant impact on local schools, highway and street patterns, demand for water and sewer services, and other activities

of local government. Only by giving the types of notice herein authorized, and considering their needs in such matters while sufficiently protecting Federal interests, can the impact of such transactions or changes in use on local government be minimized. It might be stated further that last year the Congress enacted legislation establishing similar procedures for the sale and disposition of public lands by the Department of Interior.

This section amends the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 by adding a new Title VIII—Urban Land Utilization.

"Short title

"SEC. 801. 'Federal Urban Land Use Act.'

"Declaration of purpose and policy

"SEC. 802. This section states a general policy of promoting harmonious intergovernmental relations, and prescribes use of uniform procedures in the acquisition, use, and disposal of land in urban areas to secure consistency with local zoning, land use practices, and local planning and development objectives.

"Disposal of urban lands

"SEC. 803. Requires the Administrator of the General Services Administration to notify the head of the governing body of the unit of general local government (city, county, town, parish, or village) having zoning or land use jurisdiction over the land of the proposed transaction 90 days prior to sale. The notice is designed to give the local government an opportunity to zone the use of such land in accordance with local comprehensive planning objectives. The Administrator is directed to furnish prospective purchasers with local comprehensive planning information.

"Acquisition or change of use of real property

"SEC. 804. In the acquisition or change of use of any real property in urban areas the Administrator, to the greatest extent practicable, would be required to comply with local zoning regulations and planning development objectives of the unit of local government having such jurisdiction over the land. The Administrator is further directed to consider all objections to any such acquisition or change of use made by a local government because such action would conflict with its zoning regulations and planning objectives. Subsection (b) requires the Administrator to give notice to a unit of local government in an urban area at least 90 days prior to entering a commitment to acquire real property within its jurisdiction. He may proceed without giving such notice where he determines that it would have an adverse impact on the proposed purchase. In such situations, upon completion of the acquisition, he must immediately notify the appropriate local government.

"Definitions

"SEC. 805. This section defines the terms 'unit of general local government,' 'urban area,' and 'comprehensive planning'."

DEFINITION OF TERM "VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION FACILITIES"

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. President, I introduce today, in behalf of the Senators from Hawaii [Mr. INOUYE and Mr. FONG] and my colleague from Alaska [Mr. GRUENING] a bill to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities."

Although bills similar perhaps in intent have been introduced in past years, this is a new bill.

I introduce it with the hopeful expectation that it will be considered as new by not only the appropriate legislative committees but by the Veterans' Administration and the Bureau of the Budget.

The bill I introduce today is designed to clarify a clause of existing law and to provide for a review of the merits of this clause in 10 years' time.

The clause, section 601(4)(c)(iii), provides that Veterans' Administration facilities means "private facilities for which the Administrator contracts in order to provide hospital care" in certain circumstances one of which is for veterans of any war resident in U.S. territory other than the contiguous 48 States. This at least was the purpose of this clause when it was drawn and approved by the Congress. Unfortunately, the advent of statehood in Alaska and Hawaii, which in no way changed the geographical necessity for such a clause, did serve to make unclear the VA service to be furnished Alaska and Hawaii veterans. The intent of my bill is to clear up this confusion. I propose to do this by changing the clause to read "for veterans of any war in a State, territory, commonwealth or possession of the United States not contiguous to the contiguous 48 States,". This establishes beyond a fathom of a doubt what it was the Congress wished to establish in originally approving this clause; that is that the application extends to veterans resident in any U.S. territory other than the contiguous 48 States.

My bill does one more thing. It provides that this clause shall expire at the end of 10 years. It does so because I believe that conditions change and that the conditions tomorrow may not be the same as the conditions of today, and the services provided by this clause may no longer be needed. Whether they are or not, it would be well for Congress to review the matter at that time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 562) to amend section 601 of title 38, United States Code, with respect to the definition of the term "Veterans' Administration facilities", introduced by Mr. BARTLETT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

"THIS IS THE PLACE MONUMENT" STATE PARK

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, I am today introducing a bill to transfer title to 47½ acres of land at the "This Is the Place Monument" State Park in Utah from the Department of the Army to the State of Utah.

The "This Is the Place Monument" is the most historic spot in Utah. The monument memoralizes the entry of the Mormon pioneers into the Great Salt Lake Valley on July 24, 1847. It was at the mouth of Emigration Canyon on a bluff overlooking the valley that Brigham Young announced to his hardy band of pioneers that they had arrived at the place where they would settle and which they would call home.

The "This Is the Place Monument" is administered by the Utah State Park and Recreation Commission as successor to Utah Pioneer Trails and Landmarks Association.

The monument was erected by Utah citizens pursuant to a permit which the U.S. War Department issued to the Utah Pioneer Trails and Landmarks Association on March 26, 1945. The permit was modified on December 20 of that year, giving the association the right to make other improvements.

In 1951, the Utah State Legislature assigned the responsibility for administering the "This Is the Place Monument" State Park to the State engineering commission. The action turning its administration over to the State Park and recreation commission came 6 years later. Thus, for some time the monument has been administered by an organization other than the one to which the permit for its construction and operation was issued, and the monument stands on land still owned by the Federal Government, although it is controlled and administered by the Utah Parks and Recreation Commission. The ownership of this land should be cleared. The monument is one of the show pieces of the Salt Lake Valley. Its significance to the people of Utah cannot be overstated.

I, therefore, send to the desk, for appropriate reference, a bill authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands in Utah, which are a part of the "This Is the Place Monument" State Park, to the State of Utah. I ask that the bill lie on the table until the close of business Tuesday, January 19, for cosponsorship.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Utah.

The bill (S. 563) authorizing the Secretary of the Army to convey certain lands to the State of Utah, introduced by Mr. MOSS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Armed Services.

PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION

Mr. SMATHERS. Mr. President, I introduce at this time a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the nomination and election of candidates for President and Vice President, and to succession to the office of President in the event of the death or inability of the President when the death or inability occurs with 2 years or longer remaining for the President to serve. Specifically the resolution I offer contains three proposals. It would, first, establish a direct primary for the selection of presidential and vice-presidential candidates; second, abolish the electoral college; and third, set up a special election to fill any vacancy in the Presidency or Vice-Presidency under certain circumstances.

For more than 100 years, our candidates for President and Vice President have been nominated by party conventions, and for almost as many years this system has been the subject of severe criticism, sometimes even of ridicule.

Legislators, newspaper editors, professors of government and countless average citizens have been clamoring for an overhaul of the procedure. With each succeeding election, the chorus of critics has grown louder. More and more people are calling for the demise of an archaic convention and electoral system, that is riddled with loopholes and inequities.

The criticism has been based upon a number of considerations. It has been said, with a great degree of accuracy, that the average voter has no voice in the selection of our national candidates.

It has been alleged that the conventions themselves are controlled by bosses operating in "smoke-filled rooms," rather than by convention delegates expressing a popular consensus after discussion and debate. The average television viewer could reasonably conclude that the national conventions are comprised of a small helping of deliberation served up with generous portions of noise, confusion and just plain hokum.

The wonder of it all is not that the functioning of the system sometimes goes awry, but that for so long a time it has worked as well as it has.

The system of presidential primaries, as they now function, have also been the object of growing criticism. A review of the laws governing these primaries explains why.

Presidential primary laws were first enacted in 1911 when seven States adopted such legislation. As of 1960 there were 16 States that held primaries. On the basis of even a cursory examination, it is obvious that these State laws constitute a curious collection of inconsistencies and contradictions. What is specifically required in one jurisdiction may be specifically forbidden in another.

In six States and the District of Columbia, the ballot must not show the delegate's preference among the candidates; delegates must run on a "no preference" basis on their ballots. In three States, the ballot may show the delegate's preference if the candidate consents, but delegates may also run on a "no preference" basis. In two States, the ballot may show the delegate's preference, whether or not the candidate consents, but delegates may also run on a "no preference" basis.

Finally, in four States, the ballot must show the delegate's preference for a candidate who has given consent; but delegates must not run on a "no preference" basis.

In some jurisdictions, the names of delegates pledged to major candidates do not appear on the ballot out of courtesy to favorite sons, and for reasons of their own, some candidates do not wish to compete in a particular State.

Since only about one-third of the States have primaries, it can happen that a major candidate enters and wins in all of them and still fails to receive the nomination of his party.

Clearly, this crazy quilt system is totally inadequate, and agreement on that point is will nigh universal.

In 1956, for instance, a public opinion poll taken after the conventions of that year showed that 58 percent of the voters favored a change in the method of selecting candidates for President and Vice President. Other polls have found that as much as 73 percent of the electorate would like to relegate to the history books that strange, exciting, but thoroughly unsatisfactory and inefficient spectacle, the national convention.

Mr. President, the resolution I offer would eliminate the convention system and replace it with a uniform national primary.

Under the terms of the joint resolution, both parties would hold their primaries in all States on the same day, under rules established by the legislatures of the States. The names of all candidates would be on the ballot in all States. Voters could vote only in the primary of the party in which they were registered.

Each party in each State would have a number of nominating votes equal to the number of seats it has in the Congress of the United States. Each candidate would receive a fractional part of the nominating vote corresponding to the proportion of his party's vote cast for him in the primary.

If a vacancy should occur on the ticket prior to the general election, due to death or resignation, it would be the duty of the national party committee to fill it.

This, it seems to me, would provide a nominating system that would insure popular control within the parties, and that would be practical and workable.

The second aspect of the resolution I offer concerns the electoral college system.

No part of our system of electing our President and Vice President has been criticized more often or more severely than the electoral college.

Because it has long been realized that the electoral college is an anachronism in the modern world, scores of proposals have been made for tinkering with it. I do not want to tinker with it; I want to abolish it. In doing this, we would be officially recognizing changes that have occurred in our society in the last 200 years.

It is a simple statement of fact that our Founding Fathers held a conception of democracy vastly different from ours. They were not convinced that democracy as we know it was either right or inevitable. It appears that to a certain extent they believed in government by the elite, the wise, the wealthy and the well born.

After generations of experience, however, we know that our national interests are best served when there is broad participation on the part of the people in the determinations of overall government policy.

Now that the United States Supreme Court has laid down the "one man, one vote" doctrine, it is incumbent upon the Congress to eliminate the most glaring violation of that doctrine, the use of the electoral college.

Under the present system, the candidate who receives one less than a majority, even though his vote total runs into the millions, has all these votes count for nothing. They are as so many scraps of paper. This is hardly a stirring demonstration of democracy in action.

A glaring example of the inequity of our system occurred in the election of 1876. In that year, Samuel J. Tilden received 250,000 more popular votes than his opponent, Rutherford B. Hayes. Yet Hayes won more electoral votes, and he, not Tilden, became President.

While it is unlikely, this result could happen again. It will continue to be a possibility until we rid ourselves of a system that at best is cumbersome and, at worst, is in direct conflict with our carefully nurtured vision of democracy.

The third aspect of the resolution I offer today is concerned with filling the office of the Vice-Presidency in the event of the President's death or disability.

It would accomplish this by providing, under certain circumstances, for a special election for the office of President and Vice President in the event of the President's death or disability.

Under the Constitution today, when a Vice President succeeds to the Presidency, the country is without a Vice President until the next presidential election. History records some very extended periods when this was the case.

For example, President William Henry Harrison died in April 1841, 1 month after his inauguration, and was succeeded by John Tyler, who served for 3 years and 11 months without a Vice President. In another case, President James A. Garfield, who was shot on July 2, 1881, lingered until his death on September 19. He was then succeeded by Chester Arthur, who served the balance of the term without a Vice President. We have just been through a period of more than a year when the Nation has been without a Vice President.

If anything happened to President Johnson during the period from November 22, 1963, to January 20, 1965, we would have to rely upon the provisions of the Presidential Succession Act of 1886, as revised and amended in 1947. The original act provided for succession on the executive side, beginning with the Secretary of State. The 1947 amendment established a succession on the legislative side.

This change was justified on the merits of elevating to the presidency an elected official, the Speaker of the House, rather than the Secretary of State, who obtained his office by appointment.

I find it difficult to see where the new arrangements have any significant advantage over the old.

In times like the present, there is no adequate substitute for having an experienced Vice President, ready at a moment's notice—if need be—to take over the responsibilities of the presidency.

Perhaps, in earlier times, when the tempo of events was slower and our matters of national concern were less complex, it did not make a great deal of difference if we were without a Vice President for months or even years. The office was not a very exacting one, to be sure, demanding few duties other than

that of presiding over the Senate and casting a vote on those rare occasions when it was necessary to break a tie.

This is no longer the case. President Eisenhower made extensive use of the services of Vice President Nixon, in a variety of situations and capacities.

President Kennedy greatly expanded the duties and the responsibilities of the Vice President.

This mid-20th century evolution of the office of the Vice President is not likely to abate. Every indication points to the probability that President Johnson will make even more extensive use of the great ability of his Vice President HUBERT HUMPHREY.

If the Vice President is to continue his vital role in the administration of the executive branch of our Government, then obviously the national interests demand that there be a Vice President in office at all times.

That is what I propose to accomplish in my constitutional amendment. I sincerely trust that the Senate will give this resolution favorable consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 28) proposing an amendment to the Constitution relating to the nomination and election of candidates for President and Vice President, and to succession to the office of President in the event of the death or inability of the President, introduced by Mr. SMATHERS, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AMENDMENT OF STANDING RULES OF THE SENATE RELATING TO THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, I submit, for appropriate reference, a resolution which is identical with one which I sponsored, together with 32 of our colleagues on January 15, 1963. During the 88th Congress other Senators joined us as cosponsors of the resolution.

The resolution provides essentially that the Select Committee on Small Business of the Senate shall have authority to have bills and resolutions referred to it and to report legislation for consideration on the floor of the Senate.

Mr. President, the Select Committee on Small Business does not now have this authority. It is empowered only to investigate and study problems peculiarly affecting the small business of this country. Such limited authority is unfortunate, to say the least, especially when problems are found to exist, can be identified, and yet are prevented from being considered by the Senate because the committee cannot report to the floor in a form upon which we can act.

This is in no way a criticism of other committees. Each of them does a very commendable job. But, we should not permit the problems of small business, some of which are acute indeed, to be laid aside because of other pressures.

Once the Select Committee on Small Business has isolated a problem, it should not be frustrated with the inability to bring such matters to the attention of the Senate for debate and vote.

This resolution, for which I have requested the same designation—Senate Resolution 30—as it had in the 88th Congress, simply gives to the Select Committee on Small Business the authority to report legislation to the Senate for its consideration, within certain areas relating solely to the small business of our country.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that some action might soon be forthcoming on this resolution. Because the Committee on Rules was pressed practically without relent during the 88th Congress, there was little time for action on this approval.

However, during the closing days of the past session, specifically on August 13, 1964, the chairman of the Committee on Rules, the distinguished Senator from North Carolina, gave his assurances that hearings will be held on this resolution during the present session of the Congress.

Mr. President, I thank the chairman for those words. I look forward to an early date for those hearings. The small businesses of this Nation and the millions of people whom they serve are entitled to nothing less than sincere consideration of this problem.

It is my hope that Senators who cosponsored this resolution during the 88th Congress will do so again. Certainly also, I would welcome any other Senators who might wish to join us.

I ask unanimous consent that this resolution might remain at the desk for a period of 1 week, until the close of business on Friday, January 22, for additional cosponsors.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be received, appropriately referred; and, without objection, will lie on the desk, as requested by the Senator from Vermont.

The resolution (S. Res. 30) was referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

S. RES. 30

Resolved, That S. Res. 58, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 20, 1950, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"That there is hereby created a select committee to be known as the Committee on Small Business, to consist of seventeen Senators to be appointed in the same manner and at the same time as the chairman and members of the standing committees of the Senate at the beginning of each Congress, and to which shall be referred all proposed legislation, messages, petitions, memorials, and other matters relating to the problems of American small business enterprises.

"It shall be the duty of such committee to study and survey by means of research and investigation all problems of American small business enterprises, and to obtain all facts possible in relation thereto which would not only be of public interest, but which would aid the Congress in enacting remedial legislation.

"Such committee shall from time to time report to the Senate, by bill or otherwise, its recommendations with respect to matters referred to the committee or otherwise within its jurisdiction."

SEC. 2. Subsection (d) of XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate is amended by striking out in paragraph 2, the words "under this rule."

THREE-MINUTE STATEMENTS DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the custom of the 3-minute statement during the morning hour is a convenient and expeditious method for meeting a common need, and has been a regular part of Senate proceedings since 1953. By this custom, Senators have the opportunity to briefly comment on issues of the day, or on worthy editorials, speeches, and other matter which they insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD during this period.

Yet, this custom or practice is not based upon any existing rule of the Senate. It has developed from habit, on the basis of unanimous consent. Rule VII allows for the presentation of petitions and memorials, reports of standing and select committees, the introduction of bills and joint resolutions, and the introduction of concurrent and other resolutions, in that order. This is the only morning hour business expressly prescribed.

The Senate rules permit "brief statements," in connection with the business prescribed, but the customary 3-minute statement dealing with extraneous subjects lacks this sanction. It is necessary for the majority leader to request unanimous consent, and obtain it, before Senators can engage in this needed practice. Any one Senator can deny all other Senators the convenience of making 3-minute statements in the morning hour simply by voicing an objection.

I think it is high time that we fortify the morning hour 3-minute statement by appropriate revision of the rules. There surely exists every recommendation for making it a permanent privilege. The practice meets the needs of all Senators, providing a convenient time, before the Senate takes up its unfinished business, for them to express their views on current matters. If we are to honor the rule on germaneness during the 3 hours following the morning hour, then we have pressing need for this safety valve in our proceedings.

It is no accident that the 3-minute custom came into being. It took form in the Senate more than 11 years ago, and was partly fashioned by the late great Republican Senator, Robert A. Taft. It met a pressing need, developed as a functional tradition, and has earned the right of permanency. What custom has sanctified, the rules ought properly to prescribe.

I, therefore, send to the desk a resolution which would amend rule VII of the Standing Rules of the Senate by adding to the matters of morning business prescribed, the following: Statements or comments not to exceed 3 minutes.

Mr. President, this simple amendment which I propose would not alter the existing rules concerning the placing of insertions in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The resolution relates only to the 3-minute period that Senators should be allowed, in accordance with what has been, and is, customary practice for the making of such insertions. The insertions themselves, whether during the morning hour or afterward, would remain a mat-